

### REMARKS

The applicant thanks the examiner for conducting a follow-up interview with the applicant's representatives Misha K. Hill and David L. Feigenbaum on October 16, 2007. The representatives and the examiner discussed proposed amendments to claim 1.

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

**4. Claims 1-9, 11-14, 16-19, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. ...**

**The specification, as originally filed, fails to disclose the first and second sets of relationships.**

**The specification also fails to disclose the relationship information including identifications of people.**

The claims have been amended, and are supported, for example, as noted below.

Claim Element	Example Support
for a set of display units that communicate with one another	"The unit includes ... RFID and infrared" (p. 4, lines 19-22); "the display 12" (p. 5, line 1)
and are being worn by respective wearers	"The unit is adapted to hang around the wearer's neck" (p. 4, line 24)
at an event that involves social networking,	"One use of the tag of the invention is to keep track of people that a wearer meets at a conference." (p. 12, lines 12-13)
enabling storage of identifications of people who were within a social network of a wearer of a display unit of the set prior to the user's arrival at the event	"Therefore a person's social network will contain not only historical relationship data that the person has entered into the network," (p. 8, lines 3-5); "Additionally, social network data can be downloaded into the tags." (p. 8, line 8)
enabling additions, to the stored identifications, of identifications of people who are identified ... as having been met by the wearer during the event and therefore as being within the social network of the wearer	"The tags keep track of people with whom a wearer has come in contact, as described above. This information can then be downloaded into the social network database." (p. 8, lines 2-3)
who are identified, as a result of communication by the first display unit with a second display unit of the set [quoted out of order]	"The infrared channel built into the tag transmits data to other tags, receives data from other tags" (p. 7, lines 4-5); "The tags keep track of people with whom a wearer has come in contact, as described above." (p. 8, lines 2-3)
in each of multiple interactions between pairs of the wearers of the display units,	"Then, when a wearer meets someone face-to-face who also has his social network in the tag" (p. 8, lines 8-9)

enabling one of the display units being worn by a first one of the wearers of the pair to automatically communicate the stored identifications of people that were within the social network of the first wearer,	<p>“They spend a good part of their initial conversation time trying to find out who they may know in common ... The tags perform that function in conjunction with each person’s social database contained in their respective tags” (p. 8, lines 12-17)</p> <p>“When you meet someone, your tag can compare the names of people you have met at the conference with the names of people she has met.” (p. 12, lines 25-26)</p>
enabling, without wearer intervention, analysis of the social network of the first wearer and the social network of a second one of the wearers of the pair;	<p>“Then, when a wearer meets someone face-to-face who also has his social network in the tag, the two people can immediately find out to what extent their social networks overlap” (p. 8, lines 8-10)</p> <p>“When you meet someone, your tag can compare the names of people you have met at the conference with the names of people she has met.” (p. 12, lines 25-26)</p>
enabling one or both of the display units of the pair to display a measure expressing a result of the analysis of the social network of the first wearer and the social network of the second wearer.	<p>“the tags can display the number of people whom the two wearers have met in common, thus demonstrating whether the two wearers have been mingling in the same circles, or the extent of the overlap between the people one person met compared to another” (p. 12, lines 27-30)</p>

**Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lightman et al. (US Patent No. 6,711,414).**

Claim 1 has been amended.

Lightman does not describe, and would not have made obvious, storing “identifications of people who were within a social network of a wearer” prior to the event, automatically communicating the stored identifications of people within the social network of the first wearer in an interaction between interacting pairs of wearers, analyzing the social networks of the two wearers in an interaction, or displaying “a measure expressing a result of” that analysis, let alone claim 1 as a whole.

As explained in the specification, these features allow the display units to enhance interactions. For example, “when a wearer meets someone face-to-face who also has his social network in the tag, the two people can immediately find out to what extent their social networks

overlap ... This is similar to the real world social game people play when they meet new people. They spend a good part of their initial conversation time trying to find out who they may know in common. ... The tags perform that function in conjunction with each person's social database contained in their respective tags" (p. 8, lines 8-17).

Lightman describes "social filtering:"

As noted above, the invention can also participate in social filtering. The social filtering can allow the data acquired from one or more badges to be searched or organized to provide various information. For example, the data can be used to identify those attendees that a badge enabled user spoke with for more than ten minutes, or all people at the event that were talked with by anyone for more than ten minutes. Further, the data can be used to determine who was popular at the event, who should attendees have talked to, etc. Participants can be provided with the ability to restrict the distribution or use of private data. (col. 9, lines 22-32)

but nothing in Lightman suggests that "social filtering" includes communicating "stored identifications of people that were within the social network of the first wearer" where those identifications include "identifications of people who were within a social network of a wearer of a display unit of the set prior to the user's arrival at the event," or then analyzing the social networks of the two wearers and displaying a "measure" of the result of any such analysis.

**the device and method in Lightman is also to pass information between the first display to the second display, such information pertaining to a first set of relationships and is compared to the second set of relationships. Also, Applicant should note that "first set of relationship" indeed is a criteria of social filtering.**

Lightman does not describe "analysis of the social network of the first wearer and the social network of [the second wearer]." In particular, there is no support for the examiner's assertion that the "first set of relationship[s]" is a criteria of social filtering *in Lightman*, nor of an application of that reasoning to the amended claim 1. Suggesting that the claimed analysis is anticipated or made obvious by a generic disclosure of filtering by criteria, or by specific examples that do not include the claimed analysis of social networks described by identifications of people, merely because one input to the claimed analysis may also be considered criteria, is impermissible hindsight reasoning. **The mere mention of social filtering does not inherently disclose details about what information is exchanged to perform such filtering.**

Every example of criteria in Lightman involves the first wearer entering criteria. There is no suggestion of using device-acquired data to formulate new criteria to compare to the other wearer's data, as opposed to using the described user-defined criteria to search the acquired data.

The examiner also states:

8. Claims 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lightman et al. (US Patent No. 6,711,414) in view of Lee (US 2002/0180762).

Lightman fails to disclose a first mode and second mode. However, the concept of displaying information on a display worn by a wearer, wherein text is display in two different modes, first mode is adapted for viewing at a distance by a second person, and second is adapted for viewing by a first person (wearer) is known in the art as taught in Lee. See front-page figure. In light of this teaching, a skilled artisan would have readily recognized incorporating this feature in the Lightman system because it will aid the viewer in viewing the display.

...

It is submitted that Lee has a display mode to be viewed by the user or wearer of the device (fig. 2b). Thus, it has a mode for being read close up by the user of the device. The other mode is for being viewed by the passersby, therefore, it is used for being viewed at a distance by a second person.

Claim 21 has been amended and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. In addition, there is no basis for the examiner's statement that one of the modes in Lee is for being viewed by passerby. To the contrary, both modes are described as being for the benefit of the user:

The mode selection key is a kind of function key, which is used for changing an LCD display direction by 180°, by reversing LCD display positions horizontally and vertically so as to *enable the user to perceive the image* displayed on the LCD 130 of the portable telephone from its expected perspective (i.e., with characters and other images in their normal and upright position), even when the portable telephone is turned upside down. (¶ 0021, emphasis added)

Consequently, through the display direction change function of the portable telephone, *the user can easily perceive* whatever image is displayed on the LCD 130 of the inverted portable telephone attached to *his waist belt* or the portable telephone necklace hung around *his neck*. (¶ 0025, emphasis added)

#### Information Disclosure Statement

A Fourth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449 was filed in the above-captioned patent application on November 29, 2006. Applicants have not yet

received the examiner's copy of the Form PTO-1449, initialed to acknowledge that the Examiner has considered the disclosed information.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner initial and return a copy of the subject Form PTO-1449.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims, or (d) has removed language from a claim indicates that a related feature has been deliberately expressed more broadly than previously expressed and may require additional searching by the examiner.

Enclosed is a \$525.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing 18601-003002.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-22-07



Misha K. Hill  
Reg. No. 59,737

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin St  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906